



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/006,882 | 12/10/2001 | Heidi Meyer | V-261.00 | 2886 |
| 44444 | 7590 | 07/28/2004 | EXAMINER | |
| BAXTER HEALTHCARE CORPORATION ONE BAXTER PARKWAY DF2-2E DEERFIELD, IL 60015 | | | CHEN, STACY BROWN | |
| | | ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | | 1648 |

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Advisory Action | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/006,882 | MEYER ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Stacy B Chen | Art Unit 1648 | |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 04 May 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
 - (a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: ____.

3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): See Continuation Sheet.
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: none.

Claim(s) objected to: none.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-21.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.

8. The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

10. Other: _____

Continuation of 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): The rejection of claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for failing to meet the written description requirement is withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendment. The rejection of claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness regarding the reduction in temperature process step, is withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendment.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Claims 1-21, as amended in the after-final response, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1, 12 and depending claims 2-11 and 13-21, recite "whereby HAV is continuously released into the cell culture medium because infected cells release at least 50% of viral antigen into said medium". It is unclear how the release of viral antigens into the cell culture medium is the cause of virus (whole) being released into the cell culture medium. If Applicant intends to claim that at least 50% of viral antigen is released into the medium, then the method preamble should be drawn to the production of HAV antigens. If Applicant intends to claim that virus (whole) is released into the medium, then it is unclear how the release of viral antigens results in the release of whole virus since viruses are assembled inside cells.

Stacy B. Chen
July 14, 2004

(571-272-0846)

JAMES C. HOUSEL
JAMES HOUSEL 7/26/04
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600